



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

O thou unknown, Almighty Cause
 Of all my hope and fear,
 In whose dread presence, ere an hour,
 Perhaps I must appear!

to see the difference between the work of talent and the work of genius.

In his rôle as prisoner of the Vatican, Leo writes under his own portrait in 1883 two fine elegiac distichs suggested by the aged Hildebrand's bitter complaint: "I have loved justice and hated iniquity: *therefore* I die an exile":

Iustitiam colui; certamina longa, labores,
 Ludibria, insidias, aspera quaeque tuli;
 At fidei vindex non flectar; pro grege Christi
 Dulce pati, ipsoque in carcere dulce mori.

In diction and syntax the poems perhaps never go beyond the extreme bounds of poetic license; but in the prose notes appended it is mournfully apparent that his Holiness is not infallible in his prose Latinity, either in diction or in syntax. Locutions absolutely inadmissible in good prose occur, often where there is no excuse of necessity for departing from good classical usage. Among these are ante-classical and post-classical words, and constructions which in classical Latin are found in poetry only and even there are rare, like *integer vitae*, p. 36; but of course the corn of modern thought cannot always be measured in the classical Latin bushel.

CHAS. CHANDLER.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

THE TEXT OF THE OLD TESTAMENT.

In his small but important pamphlet Kittel¹ advocates a new edition of the Hebrew Bible which may be used as a real substitute for the massoretic text, especially for academic lectures. He begins with Klostermann's word:

Es ist ein Übelstand, dass, während dem griechischen und lateinischen Unterrichte berichtigte Texte mit Angabe der Varianten zu Grunde gelegt werden, hebräisch gelehrt wird nach der *editio princeps* des massoretischen Textes. . . . Es ist ein Übelstand, dass die akademische Jugend mit dem Vorurteile, in dem hebräischen Codex den überlieferten Text, oder gar die authentische Schrift des biblischen Autors zu besitzen, in die Vorlesung kommt, und deshalb jede Abweichung des Lehrers ihr das Gefühl einer willkürlichen Neuerung weckt.

¹*Ueber die Notwendigkeit und Möglichkeit einer neuen Ausgabe der hebräischen Bibel.* Von RUDOLF KITTEL. Leipzig: Deichert, 1902. 86 pages. M. 2.

A philologically good edition purged from manifest mistakes is needed. In the first part Kittel shows the necessity of such an edition. Our common editions are based upon the prints of the sixteenth century, especially upon the Complutensian Polyglot and the Bamberg Bible. The only MSS. that can be dated with certainty belong to the tenth and eleventh centuries. So that there is an interval of about 2,000 years between the oldest Old Testament texts (800-700 B. C.) and an interval of ten to sixteen or seventeen centuries between the latest Old Testament texts and these MSS. But from the time of the Massorites the text was fixed. Working back from the time of the Naqdanim (about 650-700 A. D.) through Mishnah, Gemarah, and Midrash, and through Jerome and Origen, the work of the Massorites can be followed to the time of Aquila, *i. e.*, the reign of Hadrian (117-38 A. D.). Though the interval is thus lessened by about 800 years, it is still great enough to excite the wish to lessen it even more, especially if it is considered to how manifold accidents the text was exposed when it was still without the protecting care of the Massorah (chap. i, pp. 4-13). These various sources of error are next considered. First, the twofold change of script from the ancient Hebrew script, in which the oldest writings were written, to the middle Hebrew script which was introduced shortly after the exile, and from this middle to the square script, the lower limit of whose introduction is the time of Christ. All Old Testament books had to undergo at least one change of script and not a few a twofold change. That such a change could not be effected without numerous mistakes on the part of the copyists is plain. Add to this the uncertainty of the division of the words, the lack of vocalization, the meager use of the *matres lectionis* and other sources of error at which Kittel only hints (p. 30; *cf.* also p. 3), and it will be agreed that the *textus receptus* is by no means free from mistakes, and the necessity of a revision is demonstrated (chap. ii, pp. 14-31).

The discussion of the possibility of a revision forms the second part of the book. Kittel defines first of all the attainable aim (chap. iii, pp. 32-47). It is true the ideal of all our endeavor is the recovery of the original texts of the authors. But "for the older and in the main also for the middle writings of the Old Testament this ideal aim is unattainable." Two propositions prove this: (1) As regards the consonantal text, our helps for its recovery go back with the few exceptions of the parallel texts only as far as the oldest translation, the LXX. (2) Even if we could restore the original consonantal text with absolute certainty

we should not know how it was pronounced at the time of the authors. For though we know that the massoretic pronunciation represents a later stage of the language, we have no means of restoring the system of vocalization of the old Hebrew, say of the tenth to the eighth centuries or even of the sixth or fifth centuries, B. C. The attainment of the ideal being impossible, the real aim must be to trace the text back of the Massorites to a definite point which lies between them and the originals. Kittel finds this point of time in "the text of those writings which the Jewish community read in the fourth and third centuries, B.C.," in other words, in the Hebrew text of the time of the LXX. The chief help for the reconstruction of this text is, of course, the LXX. The later translations are of value mainly in that they help us to control the LXX text. If they give a reading which for internal reasons is more correct than that of the LXX, that reading is to be accepted, for though the LXX did not read it, it may reasonably be supposed that the later translator had a Hebrew MS. before him, and it is not the text of the LXX itself, but that of the time of the LXX, that is sought. The parallel passages also are very valuable, but their number is unfortunately small. Where internal and external reasons show that the text is corrupt, in spite of the agreement of the versions, and where there are no parallel passages which could offer help, there remains as the last refuge the conjecture. But the right of conjecture for an edition such as is here intended is limited to those cases where it is probable, or at least possible, that the readings were to be found in MSS. from this time of 300 B. C. If, *e. g.*, a case comes up where it seems clear that the author wrote a certain word or phrase, restored by conjecture, this conjectured reading, however valuable it may be in itself, must not be received into the text-edition, if there are reasons for believing that the text of the time which is wanted here did not correspond any more to the original text. Else we should get a variegated text and not a uniform text, such as has been read at one time.

In which direction has this text to be sought? Only in the direction of the massoretic text, for "not any older text which is more or less closely related to the massoretic text, but the direct ancestor, the grandfather or great grandfather of the massoretic text" is sought. The LXX is an independent recension; its Hebrew original represents therefore a parallel of the massoretic text, but not the form of the massoretic text of that time. Thus only "where both recensions show the same type are they of help to each other, for here their differences signify indeed but variants of the same original text." It is clear that

not the LXX, but the massoretic text, must form the basis of the new edition. But how is this text to be vocalized? Does the massoretic punctuation represent the pronunciation of 300 B. C. (chap. iv, pp. 47-67)? After a careful and acute investigation of the pronunciation of the LXX, Kittel comes to the conclusion "that we may regard the pronunciation of the Massorah on the whole as customary already at the time of the Alexandrian translation," it being *a priori* probable that the entire system of Hebrew pronunciation has not been formed artificially by later reflection, but has been handed down as to its essential contents. And this conclusion Kittel maintains also against Sievers by showing that the time of the change of the ancient to the present pronunciation took place, not about the time of Christ, but in the first centuries after the exile, when the worship of the synagogue was established and with it the regular public reading of Biblical passages. With this coincides also the introduction of the system of cantillation in the reading of poetical texts, upon which system our pronunciation is based. This makes the question of the metrical character of the texts of "only secondary importance" for Kittel's edition (chap. v, pp. 67-76). While agreeing with Sievers as to a more ancient pronunciation of Hebrew poetry and the necessity of building the Hebrew metrical system upon this older pronunciation of the time when the poetry was composed, Kittel maintains that the system of cantillation of the Massorites was essentially accepted at the time in which the text is sought. Still, prosody is not without value for the edition. Those parts which were still written stichometrically at that time, as some MSS. of the LXX and some Hebrew codices would indicate, must be represented thus in the new edition. "Where a verse can still be recognized as such, it is . . . to be printed as verse. . . . Where, however, as so often, especially in the prophetic books, the verse cannot be restored any more or only by means of greater operations, simply *scriptio continua* is to be chosen."

In the last chapter (chap. vi, pp. 76-84) Kittel speaks of the arrangement of the proposed edition and makes the following points: (1) The massoretic text being the most important text for the reconstruction of the original, must be made the basis with consonants and vowels. (2) The massoretic text may be given as the text, and all changes be put in the form of footnotes, or the revised text may be given as the text, and the massoretic deviations be recorded in the margin; Kittel favors the latter. (3) In regard to the accents Kittel proposes, in so far as they are signs of punctuation—Kittel here follows Prætorius—to use only *Sillûq*, *Sôphpasûq*, *'Athnah*, *Zakheph* and

R'bhî, and perhaps also *S'gholta*. For the books **בנ"א**, besides *Sillûq*, only 'Ôlêw'yôredh and 'Athnah, and perhaps also *R'bhî gadhâl*. In so far as they simply mark the tone, they should be placed only where the accentuation determines the sense. (4) No distinction of the different sources of a book by means of different types or colors must be made, since the edition wants to give a text such as has really been read in 300 B.C., and it can of course not be assumed that the redactor indicated his sources in some external form. By this Kittel means to distinguish his edition from such works as Paul Haupt's "The Sacred Book of the Old Testament" (SBOT), but the reason he gives is not cogent. For he certainly does not mean that he wants to reproduce exactly the text of 300 B. C. outwardly, for in that case he must use, not the square, but the middle script; the representation of the different sources by colors would be no greater violation of his principle than the use of the square letters. Still for *practical* reasons Kittel's proposal is to be approved for his edition, for it is not primarily for scholars, but for students, and the practical use might be limited especially in our country, if it be identified with any one, even though it be the dominant, school of criticism. All of Kittel's practical suggestions are sane, cautious and to the point. The necessity of some such edition as Kittel proposes is apparent and is felt by every teacher of Hebrew. Kittel might have added that the constant inevitable emending of the text in the class, while it produces in some antagonism, produces in others the idea that the Hebrew text is so unreliable that it hardly pays to study it unless one wishes to become an expert; and that is an idea which would prove fatal with the study of any language.

The main proposition to reconstruct the text of 300 B. C. will at once be met by the statement that a goodly part of the Old Testament literature was written later. But this should really not be urged against Kittel; he knows it himself and means by "about 300 B. C." the time for the main body of the Old Testament. The text of those MSS. which underlie the translations made from about 280-150 B. C. is to be reconstructed (p. 38). He gets the "about 300 B. C." by reasoning that these MSS. were not written merely for the purpose of translation, and may therefore be dated one or two generations higher.

But the main question is: Is the ideal which Kittel sets himself attainable? The objection that "a critical edition of LXX on philological principles is indispensable . . . such problems as it presents cannot be solved *ambulando*" (G. F. Moore, *Judges*, SBOT, p. 22),

Kittel has already considered (p. 38, note). He concedes the justice of the objection, but declares that also a printed edition, if it existed, would not free us from the duty of deciding from case to case, for it would have a subjective character. It would simply mean less labor. Kittel is right when he does not wish to wait for such an edition of the LXX, for even the Oxford edition will not altogether be "a critical edition on philological principles."

In regard to the vocalization, it may perhaps be doubted whether the vocalization of the massoretic system is to be presupposed for the time about 300 B. C. Still, since we compromised in regard to the square script, we may do so here for practical reasons. The question becomes somewhat more important since Paul Kahle has adduced his material for the vocalization of the text according to the Babylonian system and has shown that it differs from the Palestinian in a good many instances, and corresponds very often with the pronunciation presupposed by the LXX.

One of the great advantages of Kittel's text is its uniformity; he wants to avoid *Buntscheckigkeit*. But is it really possible for him to reproduce a text such as has once actually been read about 300 B. C.? Now Kittel is extremely cautious in regard to conjectures; he would introduce only such conjectures into the text as do not exclude the possibility of finding support in MSS. of that time. But is not here, after all, some of the *Buntscheckigkeit*? A text with these emendations has never been read. The MSS. may all come from that specific time, but certainly no two of them would be alike. The use of the various MSS. for correction does not produce a text "wie er zu irgend einer Zeit einmal wirklich gelesen . . . worden ist." Such a text is a resultant text, but has never been read. Here again we might for practical reasons agree with Kittel's proposal, and certainly such a resultant text of about 300 B. C. would be a very fine thing to have, but since a checkered text cannot be altogether avoided, it would seem that the right of conjecture should be extended, and that surely such conjectures as those of which Kittel speaks, which represent the original reading of the author, should be admitted into the text even if they are not represented in MSS. of 300 B. C.

It is to be hoped that Kittel's proposed edition will really be published; it will be a great boon to students and teachers alike. Kittel's calm, clear, sane views inspire a feeling of confidence. Surely for such an edition great reserve and objectivity are necessary besides the other requisites, and Kittel impresses one as having all these.

The work of Paul Kahle² on the massoretic text according to the Babylonian Jews has already been referred to above in connection with the ancient pronunciation. The MSS. which we have known so far in Babylonian vocalization exhibit no real differences in regard to the vocalization, though they use other methods of punctuation. It is, of course, to be presupposed that there must have been decided differences at the time when men began to exhibit the traditional oral pronunciation in written form. And some Jews of the ninth and following centuries inform us that even in their time differences between the Palestinian and Babylonian Jews still existed. But their information does not accord with the Babylonian MSS. which we have, and it must be concluded that these MSS. have been influenced by the Palestinian method of vocalization. Now Paul Kahle has found in the Berlin MS. or qu. 68o a real Babylonian MS. containing a Bible fragment with Massorah. And this MS. corresponds, as Kahle shows, with the statements of the ninth-century Jews. In regard to the method of vocalization, etc., it differs very much from those which we know already. *It presents also in details of punctuation an abundance of different traditions. We get here really a number of variants in the Hebrew text; it confirms several conjectures which have been made in regard to the Palestinian vocalization and gives them thus documentary foundation. It presents in many points a vocalization which agrees often much more with the transcriptions of LXX and with the traditions in Eusebius, Jerome, et al., than is the case with the Palestinian.* It makes it possible to judge the Palestinian punctuation from an independent point of view. It agrees, of course, with the latter in the main, if the different method of punctuation is not taken into account. But it is a remnant from a time when the vocalization had not yet become so uniform as later on through the Palestinian Massorites (p. 7). This is the summary of the investigations of the author, which show the great importance of the MS. The MS. is described (chap. ii, pp. 7-13). Then follows a chapter on the oriental Massorah, where under *b*, the importance of the MS. for the control of the lists of the eastern and western readings is brought out (chap. iii, pp. 13-23). Chap. iv treats of the oriental punctuation of the Hebrew (pp. 24-50). Here are a number of fine observations. In chap. v we have a synopsis of the verbal and nominal forms which differ in the MS. (pp. 51-79). Here a number of variants are

²*Der masoretische Text des alten Testaments nach der Ueberlieferung der Babylonischen Juden.* Von PAUL KAHLE. Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. 108 pages. M 3.50.

treated. The rest of the variants follow in chap. vi (pp. 79-83). One look suffices to convince us of the importance of the material for textual criticism as well as for the history of the language. In Appendix I (pp. 83-9) the Massorah magna for Proverbs is given, and in Appendix II (pp. 89-108), Pss. 90-103, liber Canticum, and Threni I according to the Berlin MS. or qu. 680. The work of editing appears to be carefully done, so far as that can be judged without reference to the MS.

Every Old Testament scholar will at once perceive how valuable the contents of this little book are. And I, for one, am very grateful to the author, and trust that the other material which he promises may soon appear.

JULIUS A. BEWER.

OBERLIN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY.

SOME RECENT LITERATURE OF PHILOSOPHY.

PROFESSOR BALDWIN has brought together in a volume¹ papers which have appeared in various journals during the past fifteen years. They represent the wide range of the author's interests and publication; philosophy, historical and constructive; psychology, in both the general and the experimental lines. In many cases thought has now moved on beyond the points here discussed. Some of the essays have been incorporated for substance into the author's larger works. But the combination will be a convenience for the student. Of more especial interest to the readers of this JOURNAL are the lecture on "Psychology of Religion," which gives a summary of various points of view and an indication of the lines along which progress is making; the short paper on "Theism and Immortality," and certain aspects of several other papers. One possible value in including papers of so widely differing fields in one volume may be to make evident—if this is still in need of being made evident to any reading person—that experimental and evolutionary psychology on the one hand, and philosophical idealism on the other, may live together without discord.—Another volume of collected essays is that of Professor Howison.² The titles are: "The Limits of Evolution;" "Mod-

¹ *Fragments in Philosophy and Science*. By JAMES MARK BALDWIN. New York: Scribner, 1902. ix + 389 pages. \$2.50, net.

² *The Limits of Evolution and other Essays, Illustrating the Metaphysical Theory of Personal Idealism*. By G. H. HOWISON. New York: Macmillan, 1901. xxxv + 395 pages. \$1.60, net.